

Elzie, Teri L

0075387

mail

**From:** Zeisloft, Jamie  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 29, 2000 10:46 AM  
**To:** 'Tom\_OBrien@r1.fws.gov'; Hanford\_Trustees%FWS@r1.fws.gov  
**Cc:** Ward, Dana C; Elzie, Teri L  
**Subject:** RE: revised Columbia River Corridor, 2012 letter

Folks,

Two things. One, I can't participate in a conference call on Thursday ( I have 5 meeting scheduled already). Two, I can't support this letter as written. As I stated in yesterday's conference call, there were several statements made in the original letter that we object to. Some of these statements have not been revised to our satisfaction. And several new statements have been added which we object to (i.e. things have gotten worse, not better with this latest revision). The standing statements that we object to are as follows.

- The Council supports the concept of accelerated schedule for cleanup of the Hanford Site provided that land available for other uses is cleaned up to a standard compatible with the Hanford Reach EIS and requirements of the U.S. Department of the Interior and it's bureaus for management within the National Wildlife Refuge system. (DOI land acquisition/management standards do not apply to Hanford cleanup).

- River Corridor as these lands should be able to incorporated into the national wildlife refuge system for management by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (As per the CLUP, alternative uses includes more than management within the refuge system).

- Towards this end the Council recommends establishment of a Biological Technical Assistant Group (BTAG) to assist DOE in developing ecological studies and cleanup standards (As we've said numerous times before, we do not feel a BTAG is needed at Hanford).

- This approach was successfully carried out at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Colorado between the U.S. Department of Defense and the Service and we believe this approach should be adopted and implemented at the Hanford Site in FY2002 (Hanford is different from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. The approach used there is not needed at the Hanford Site).

Due to the apparent lack of compromise needed for NRTC consensus and the looming deadline for submitting comments, I recommend that comments be submitted on an individual trustee basis. We must be realistic, these are issues that we've debated at length before and they're not going to be resolved anytime soon.

Jamie

-----Original Message-----

From: Tom\_OBrien@r1.fws.gov [mailto:Tom\_OBrien@r1.fws.gov]  
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2000 8:52 AM  
To: Hanford\_Trustees%FWS@r1.fws.gov  
Subject: revised Columbia River Corridor, 2012 letter  
Importance: High

RECEIVED  
JAN 15 2003

EDMC

Hi everyone;

I have taken another shot at this letter as attached. It may not be to everyones liking and we need to get everyones input as soon as we can. I hope I captured all of the points raised by Jamie, Jay, Larry and Greg and have changed the letter to address them. We probably need to have another conference call set up on Thursday at 10 AM to talk about the letter again if that is ok. Jamie, can you set that up if it works for you and hopefully more trustee members can participate. I hope I have not missed anyone on the e:mail list, if I have please forward as needed.

thanks